REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 1 December 2000 with twenty claims, two of which were written in independent form. Claims 7, 9, 12, and 16 were amended on 15 December 2005. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended herein. No claims have been allowed.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,892,851 to Nguyen ("Nguyen").

The Examiner stated, "As can clearly be seen from figure 5 of Nguyen, the error portions corresponding to figure 6(630) and figure 6(620) of Nguyen (first portion) are each propagated to a pixel in said next row of pixels and the error portion corresponding to figure 6(610) of Nguyen (second portion) is propagated into the first pixel of the segment below and to the right of said last pixel. The segment below and to the right of said last pixel is to be processed next since all segments of a row are processed in parallel (column 3, lines 55-59 of Nguyen)."

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "at least two pixels in a row of pixels . . . a group of pixels to be processed next in said row of pixels" and "propagating . . . a second portion of said error word for said last pixel to a pixel in said group of pixels to be processed next." Thus, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that "at least two pixels" and "said group of pixels to be processed next" are located in the same row of pixels. Nguyen does not show, teach, or suggest this limitation.

Claims 2-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,880,857 to Shiau *et al.* ("Shiau"). The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 2-11 depend from Claim 1 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons argued above with respect to Claim 1, the prior art of record does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of amended Claim 1, much less the limitations of Claim 1 in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,118,513 to Delabastita *et al.* ("Delabastita").

Claim 12 recites, "said last pixel abutting a group of pixels to be processed next in said row of pixels . . . and propagating . . . a second portion of said error word for said last pixel to a pixel in said group of pixels to be processed next." Thus, Claim 12 has been amended to clarify

<div align="center">TI-29212 Amendment - Page 10</div>

that "said last pixel" and "said group of pixels to be processed next" are located in the same row of pixels. Nguyen does not show, teach, or suggest this limitation.

Claims 13-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen in view of Shiau, and Delabastita. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 13-20 depend from Claim 12 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons argued above with respect to Claim 12, the prior art of record does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of amended Claim 12, much less the limitations of Claim 12 in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418

TI-29212 Amendment - Page 11